

Appln. No.: 10/043,768
Amendment Dated September 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 3, 2005

SAR 14043

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Figures 1-9. These sheets replace the original sheets.

Attachment

SAR 14043

Appln. No.: 10/043,768
Amendment Dated September 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 3, 2005

Remarks/Arguments:

The drawings were objected to as including "hand writing" in the legends of Fig. 9. This ground for objection is overcome by the submission of formal drawings, substituted for the informal drawings that were filed with the application. The formal drawings do not include the matter objected to by the Examiner.

Claims 1-19 are pending in the above-identified application. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(e) as being anticipated by Heller et al. This ground for rejection is overcome by the amendment to claim 1. In particular, Heller et al. do not disclose or suggest, "a first circuit formed in said substrate and connected to receive the pixel signals and for analyzing the pixel signals *in real time* to provide a defective pixel output signal indicating if any one pixel of the plurality of pixels in the imaging array is defective, *as the pixel is being processed to generate the active video image,*" as required by amended claim 1. Basis for this amendment may be found in paragraphs [0033] and [0051].

Heller concerns a CMOS imaging device with integrated defective pixel correction circuitry that detects bad pixels as a preliminary step to generating an active video image, using a completely white image and a completely black image. Dark pixels in the white image and bright pixels in the black image are flagged as being defective and their locations are stored in a programmable memory. (See col. 5, line 58 through col. 6, line 28). When an active video image is later captured, the Heller system generates compensation pixel values for each of the known defective pixels by averaging the pixel values surrounding the defective pixel. (See col. 8, lines 57-65).

Thus, Heller does not analyze the pixel signals in real time, as the pixel is being processed to generate the active video image, to provide a defective pixel output signal indicating if any one pixel of the plurality of pixels in the imaging array is defective, as required by amended claim 1.

Because Heller does not disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Heller.

Applicants appreciate the indication in the Office Action that claims 2-11 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowed if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of their base claim and any Intervening claim. Claims 2-11 all

SAR 14043


Appln. No.: 10/043,768
Amendment Dated September 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 3, 2005

depend from claim 1. Because claim 1 is no longer subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Heller, claims 2-11 are no longer subject to objection.

Applicants also appreciate the indication in the Office Action that claims 12-19 are allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to the drawings, the rejection of claim 1 and the objection to claims 2-11.

Respectfully submitted,


Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Attorney for Applicants

KNN/tmb

Attachments: Figures 1-9 (5 sheets)

Dated: September 2, 2005

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (571)273-8300 on:

September 2, 2005


Tonya M. Berger